

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the sheet with the previously amended Figure 1 with the attached sheet showing the currently amended Figure 1.

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following arguments. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

REMARKS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Office Action objected to Figure 1 on the grounds that reference characters 103 and 105 were not mentioned in the description. The current amendments to the specification rectify this situation as well as ensure that reference character 117 is mentioned in the description. No new matter was added in these amendments.

REMARKS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office Action objected to Figure 1 as last amended because the reference character "107" had been used to designate both Storage device 107 and Docking station 107. Figure 1 as currently amended now designates the Storage device as 107 and the Docking station as 117. No new matter was added in this amendment.

ARGUMENTS REGARDING CLAIM REJECTIONS IN THE LAST OFFICE ACTION

*Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) *Burstein* in view of *Shintomi**

The last Office Action rejected claims 19-21, 24, 27, 29-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burstein* (US 6,268,716) in view of *Shintomi* (US 5,598,089).

Regarding claim 19 and claim 29, the Applicant has amended claim 19 and claim 29 and the Applicant asserts that as amended, claim 19 and claim 29 include limitations not disclosed by *Burstein* or *Shintomi*. Specifically, claim 19 and claim 29 now include the limitation:

wherein the secondary voltage regulator has more power capacity than the primary voltage regulator.

The multiple voltage regulators disclosed both in *Burstein* and *Shintomi* appear to be identical, and no mention is made of one regulator having greater or less capacity than the

others. The Applicant thus asserts that claim 19 and claim 29 as currently amended are not rendered obvious by *Burstein* in view of *Shintomi* and are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, they are all ultimately dependent on claim 19. The Applicant asserts that these claims are in condition for allowance for at the same reason as for claim 19.

Regarding claims 30, 31, and 33, they are all ultimately dependent on claim 29. The Applicant asserts that these claims are in condition for allowance for at the same reason as for claim 29.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) *Shintomi* in view of *Bates*

The last Office Action rejected claims 19-21, 24, 27, 29-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Shintomi* (US 5,598,089) in view of *Bates* (US 3,521,150). The Applicant assumes the Office Action's citation of § 102(b) is in error and rejection based on § 103(a) was intended since the Office Action's discussion that follows does not show that *Shintomi* discloses all limitations of the rejected claims, cites additional sources and uses the term "obvious."

Regarding claim 19 and claim 29, the Applicant has amended claim 19 and claim 29 and the Applicant asserts that as amended, claim 19 and claim 29 include limitations not disclosed by *Bates* or *Shintomi*. Specifically, claim 19 and claim 29 now include the limitation:

wherein the secondary voltage regulator has more power capacity than the primary voltage regulator.

The multiple voltage regulators disclosed both in *Bates* and *Shintomi* appear to be identical, and no mention is made of any one regulator as having greater or less capacity than the others. The Applicant thus asserts that claim 19 and claim 29 as currently amended are not rendered obvious by *Shintomi* in view of *Bates* and are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, they are all ultimately dependent on claim 19. The Applicant asserts that these claims are in condition for allowance for at the same reason as for claim 19.

Regarding claims 30, 31, and 33, they are all ultimately dependent on claim 29. The Applicant asserts that these claims are in condition for allowance for at the same reason as for claim 29.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Phil Hunt at (503) 439-6073. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: _____

9/12/06



Philip Hunt
Attorney for the Client
Reg. No. 58,044

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778